

## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant wishes to point out that the originally filed request for filing a patent application asked that Claims 1-22 be cancelled before calculating the filing fee. Accordingly, Applicant did not intend Claims 1-22 to be examined in this application. In order to eliminate any uncertainty Applicant has expressly cancelled Claims 1-22 in this paper.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability of Claims 33 and 35. In response, the key language of Claims 33 and 35 has been added to Claims 32 and 34, respectively, and Claims 33 and 35 have been cancelled. Applicant submits that Claims 32 and 34 should now be in condition for allowance, as indicated in the outstanding Office Action.

With respect to the double patenting rejection, Applicant has enclosed a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) and (c). This terminal disclaimer is being filed to expedite prosecution, and is not intended as an admission that any of the claims of the present application are unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent 5,692,947.

With respect to the prior art rejections, Applicant has amended Claims 32 and 34 to include the language of allowable Claims 33 and 35, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these rejections have been overcome.

Finally, Applicant has added new Claims 36-43. New Claims 36 and 37 correspond to Claims 32 and 34 as filed, respectively, with the additional requirement that the polishing pad comprise a polyurethane material. This amendment is supported by the application as filed, as for example at page 5, line 29 of the specification. New Claims 38 and 40 correspond to originally filed Claims 32 and 34, respectively, with the addition of the last paragraph which defines the belt as comprising a high strength polymer. This amendment is supported by the application as filed, for example at page 5, line 30. New Claims 39 and 41 depend from Claims 38 and 40, respectively, and define the belt as comprising a polyethylene terephthalate resin. These claims are supported by the specification at page 5, line 31. New Claims 42 and 43 depend from

allowable Claims 32 and 34 and define the belt as being formed of stainless steel. These claims are supported by the specification at page 5, line 30.

Applicant submits that the new claims are patentable over the previously applied references. In David U.S. Patent 4,651,474 discloses a sanding machine intended to provide a uniform finish on wood surfaces, particularly wood surfaces designed for furniture (see the sentence bridging columns 1 and 2). The abrasive belt 12 is said to be a typical endless belt having an outer abrasive surface (column 2, lines 64 and 65). A sanding machine for wood is substantially unrelated to the problem addressed by this invention, which relates to the processing of semiconductor wafers. One skilled in the art, faced with a problem relating to the processing of semiconductor wafers, would not turn to sanding machines for inspiration. Even if this were done, one skilled in the art would not find any suggestion of the inventions defined by Claims 36 through 43.

With respect to Japanese Publication 7-111256, Applicant has not obtained an English language translation. Applicant notes that the original copy provided by the Examiner includes an English language note reading "soft artificial leather". Based on this information, it appears that the Japanese Publication does not suggest any of the inventions of Claims 36 through 43. Furthermore, it appears that the Japanese Publication bears a date of 4/25/95, well after the priority date of the present application. This application is a division of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/759,172, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application 08/287,658. The grandparent application has a filing date of August 9, 1994, prior to the 4/25/95 publication date of the Japanese document. For this reason, Applicant submits that the Japanese document does not qualify as a reference against the present application.

The specification of the present application is identical to the specification of grandparent application Serial No. 08/287,658. Applicant has enclosed a copy of the originally-filed specification of the grandparent application, and the Examiner will note that it is identical to the specification of the present application. For this reason, Applicant submits that it is clear that the present claims are entitled to the benefit of the August 9, 1994 filing date of the parent application.

Applicant submits that in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims pending in this application are now in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William A. Webb  
Registration No. 28,277  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4218